

The Name of the Meadow Brown

By LIEUT-COL. C. F. COWAN, F.R.E.S.

The only name by which it is proper to refer to our demure but happy denizen of the hayfields, apart from meadow brown, is *Maniola jurtina* (L.). Commonest of its misnomers, and doubly incorrect, is *Maniola* (*Epinephele*) *jurtina*", while trebly wrong is "*Maniola* (*Epinephile*) *jurtina*". The name having been as accident-prone as any, right from the "year dot", it may be worth brief comment.

Linnaeus, in both the tenth and twelfth editions of his *Systema Naturae*, described the species *Papilio jurtina*, giving citations of many earlier references and illustrations, and adding that it was a well-known insect of "grassland in Europe and Africa". Then, a couple of places further on in each edition, he described *P. janira*, citing no other references and remarking "Europe, woods. Like *jurtina* but without the yellow patch on the forewing upperside and with three dark dots on the hindwing below".

For some time, although all writers knew that these were respectively the female and the male of the same species, none liked to correct the Master. The two parallel names were quoted side by side. Eventually, by common consent, the name for the male became regarded as the "proper" one, and *janira* was generally accepted early in the 19th century.

Then the unwritten rules were made more strict, and one of them, based on the "page-precedence" principle, became increasingly favoured. The result of this was that, towards the end of the 19th century, *jurtina*, with two places precedence, became the name almost universally employed, and continued so for the first half of the 20th century. Finally, a change in the Code introduced the "First Reviser" rule to cover such cases. This meant that the correct name would depend entirely on the first author who had equated the two names and, having done so, selected one to have precedence over the other.

Among all the other repercussions caused by changing the rules, a frantic search ensued to find who first acted in this case. This resulted in the view that a definite choice "of *janira* as a name to take precedence over the name *jurtina* had been made by Fabricius as early as 1778", and that this selection was the earliest one. Acceptance of this would have caused such an upset to universal practice that a successful application was submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who, in their Opinion 506, ruled that the name *jurtina* should have precedence regardless of any previous designation. That opinion, with all the relevant references, was published in 1953 (*Opin. Decl. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.*, 18: 177-196).

Actually, all this was technically unnecessary, as Denis and Schiffermüller, in their profound and prescient work of 1775 on the Viennese butterflies, had done that very thing, and were undoubtedly the first revisers. Or were they? Perhaps they, in their turn, were anticipated, so it is well that the Commission has settled the question for all time.

Thus the correct specific name is *jurtina*. What of the generic?

One of the authors who had found it embarrassing to say that Linnaeus' two species were one and the same was Schrank, in 1801, 23 years after Linnaeus died. While placing them in a new genus, *Maniola*, he

seems to have solved his dilemma by ignoring both names and, perhaps, with the departed in mind, called the species *lemur*. In fact, subsequent action has ensured that *Papilio jurtina* Linn., 1758 and *Maniola lemur* Schrank, 1801, are objectively identical species.

Next, in 1819, Hübner introduced the name *Epinephele* for a group which included our species. Founded on the Greek noun *nephele*, a dark cloud, it has been sorely misspelt in the past, probably mainly by emendators who wanted to base it on the Greek for love. While the existence of *Maniola* was overlooked, *Epinephele* became generally used, and in that period when *janira* was also general, it was designated as the type-species. We thus have the remarkable situation where a species finds its male (*Maniola jurtina*) and its female (*Epinephele janira*) in different genera not through any structural difference, which is by no means a rare occurrence, but purely through a series of accidents in nomenclature. The case is not unique, a parallel instance being the well-known American Papilionid *Euphœades glaucus* (L., 1758) with a dimorphic female form named *Jasoniades turnus* (L., 1771); two more Hübner genera simultaneously published, the former having precedence through action by a first reviser.

Although, then, it can be said that *Maniola*, *Epinephele*, *jurtina* and *janira* are all perfectly valid names, no one now denies that the two last are conspecific. Once one equates these two, *janira* falls as a junior synonym by the International Commission ruling, and *Epinephele* falls as a junior synonym on priority. The name of the Meadow Brown is *Maniola jurtina*. There is no point in continually repeating *Epinephele*. Furthermore, it is bad form to insert that name in parentheses between the correct generic and specific names; a formula reserved for citation of subgenera under the International Code (Art. 6, also Rec. 44A).

This is not a scientific paper, and a long list of references can be dispensed with. Those interested can find them all in the very thoroughly indexed posthumous work by Francis Hemming, 1967, "Generic Names of the Butterflies and their Type-Species". *Bull Br. Mus. nat. Hist. (Ent.)* Suppl. 9, published by the British Museum (Natural History). It is hoped soon to publish a short note on the much misunderstood 1775 work by Denis and Schiffermüller.

Little Gaddesden House, Berkhamsted, Herts.

Aquatic Bugs of a Fish Pond

By J. M. JULKA*

(Central Inland Fisheries Research Institute, Barrackpore)

Central predatory aquatic bugs are voracious feeders on the fish fry and compete with them directly for food by feeding on the same micro-organisms which form the principal food of fish (Hungerford, 1919; Champlain, 1923; Alikunhi *et al.*, 1955; Ganguly and Mitra, 1961). A knowledge of these bugs will afford useful information in the success of fish culture.

* Present address—Zoological Survey of India, 27, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-13.